

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 * * *

7 GREGORY G. GRANT,

8 Plaintiff(s),

9 v.

10 NEVADA DISABILITY ADVOCACY AND
11 LAW CENTER,

12 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:14-CV-1640 JCM (CWH)

ORDER

13 Presently before the court is the matter of *Grant v. Nevada Disability Advocacy And Law*
14 *Center*, case number 2:14-cv-1640-JCM-CWH.

15 On October 6, 2014, plaintiff Gregory Grant, who is a prisoner in the custody of the Nevada
16 Department of Corrections (“NDOC”) initiated this civil rights action against defendant Nevada
17 Disability Advocacy and Law Center. (ECF No. 1).

18 On August 28, 2015, the court appointed Rebekah L. Rini as *pro bono* counsel for the
19 purpose of representing plaintiff at a competency hearing. (ECF No. 27). On May 10, 2017, the
20 court held that Grant is incompetent for the limited purpose of representing himself in this case.
21 *Id.* The court also terminated Rebekah L. Rini and referred plaintiff to the court’s Pro Bono
22 Program to identify a guardian as well as an attorney pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
23 17(c). *Id.* The Pro Bono Program was unable to secure representation for plaintiff. *See* (ECF No.
24 54).

25 On July 3, 2017, plaintiff relocated to the Northern Nevada Correctional Center in Carson
26 City, Nevada. (ECF No. 55). Despite the long distance between Las Vegas and Carson City, the
27 court attempted to appoint a guardian by placing the case through Washoe Legal Services, sending
28 a written notice to the State Bar of Nevada, sending a written notice to the University of Nevada,

1 Las Vegas, William S. Boyd School of Law, and publishing a notice in the Clark County Bar
2 Association's *Communiqué*. (ECF Nos. 63, 64, 65, 66). These efforts were also unsuccessful.

3 Because plaintiff resides at the Northern Nevada Correctional Center, any legal
4 representation will necessarily take place in the Northern counties. The court, due to its limited
5 knowledge of the resources available in those counties, has not been able to secure representation
6 for plaintiff. Therefore, the court orders the random assignment of this case to a northern district
7 judge and a northern magistrate judge so that plaintiff will have greater odds of having the merits
8 of his case adjudicated.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED

10 DATED March 7, 2019.

11 
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28